REMARKS

Claims 1-146 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-17, 19-21, 23-45, 49-94, 98-104, 108-116, 120-127, 132-138 and 140-146 stand rejected.

Claims 18, 22, 46-48, 95-97, 105, 106, 117-119, and 128-130 have been objected to.

Claims 18, 22, 46-48, 56, 57, 95-97, 105, 106, 117-119 and 128-130 have been deemed allowable, subject to Applicants addressing the related issues raised in the Office Action.

Claims 11, 25, 52-54, 58, 68, 101-103, 109, 120, 133, 134, and 138 have been amended.

Claim Objections

Claims 11, 25, 52-54, 58, 68, 101-103, and 134 are objected to for various informalities.

Claims 11, 25, 52-54, 58, 68, 101-103, and 134 have been amended to correct the informalities.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 18, 22, 46-48, 56, 57, 95-97, 105, 106, 117-119 and 128-130 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims (the allowance is subject to Applicants addressing the related issues raised in the Office Action).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 144 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, and specifically for being directed to "computer programmable medium", which includes a "carrier medium" (disclosed on page 3, paragraph 0024 of the Specification).

Claim 144 has been amended to refer to a "tangible, non-transient computer programmable medium having code stored therein and executable by a processor for ..." to limit claim 144 to a statutory category.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

"To anticipate [under 35 U.S.C. § 102], every element and limitation of the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim." *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383, 58 USPQ2d 1286, 1291 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

The corollary of that rule is that absence from the reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. DuPont De Nemours*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1573, 224 USPQ 409, 411 (Fed.Cir.1984).

I.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10-13, 26, 27, 58, 59, 62, 63, 67-70, 83, 84, 108, 141, 142, 144 and 145 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McNeely et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,130,877 (referred to herein as "*McNeely*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

McNeely teaches that a "server includes means for generating a request object and a response object for each request message received from a data network node in the communications network." *McNeely*, col. 3, lines 29-32. Thus, the "request object" and the "response object" are distinct from the request message. In the *Response to Arguments* section, p. 48 of the June 27, 2011 Office Action, the Examiner states that the "claimed "messages"" is functionally equivalent to the URL requests."

McNeely teaches, "Upon examination of at least one of the objects, a determination is made as to which one of a plurality of request processing modules to send the objects in order to further the servicing of the request message." *McNeely* more further teaches, "For each <u>URL request 102</u> received, the request switch 280 determines, <u>dependent on information contained at least in the **request object 106**</u>, to which servlet 222 or 224 the request 106 and response 108

objects should be sent for processing." Thus, *McNeely* teaches reliance on information in the request object 106 and not information in the URL request 102 to determine which servlet 222 or 224 will receive the request object 106 for processing.

Thus, since:

    (i)   *McNeely* clearly distinguishes between the request object 106 and the URL request 102,

    (ii)   the Examiner equates the URL requests with the claimed "messages", and

    (iii)   *McNeely* teaches reliance on information in the request object 106 and not information in the URL request 102 to determine which servlet 222 or 224 will receive the request object 106 for processing,

then the URL request 102 does not "comprise[] details of the predetermined set of services."

However, claims 1, 58, 108 (by reference to claim 1) require "each service executing a command specified by the message; wherein the message comprises details of the predetermined set of services. Since the URL request does not comprise "details of the predetermined set of services and the Examiner equates the URL request to the message of the claims, *McNeely* neither teaches nor suggests Claims 1, 58, or 108.

Additionally, although *McNeely* teaches that "the request switch 280 determines, dependent on information contained at least in the **request object 106**, to which servlet 222 or 224 the request 106 and response 108 objects should be sent for processing", *McNeely* does not teach what the "information contained at least in the request object 106" is. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit because there is no such clear teaching, *McNeely* also does not teach that the request object 106 "comprises details of the predetermined set of services" as required by claims 1, 58, and 108.

Furthermore, claim 1 requires "if it is determined that the message should be sent to another service, each service in the predetermined set of services transmitting the message to an

appropriate service." *McNeely* teaches that a "server includes means for generating a request object and a response object for each request message received from a data network node in the communications network." *McNeely*, col. 3, lines 29-32. Thus, the "request object" and the "response object" are distinct from the request message. As previously stated, in the *Response to Arguments* section, p. 48 of the June 27, 2011 Office Action, the Examiner states that the "claimed "messages"" is functionally equivalent to the URL requests." *McNeely* further teaches that at "least one switching component is operable to examine at least one of the request object and the response object in determining at least one of the plurality of request processing modules to which to forward the <u>request and response objects."</u> *Id.*, lines 36-40. Thus, *McNeely* does <u>not</u> teach that the URL request is forwarded, but rather teaches that the request object and the response object are forwarded. Since, the Examiner states that the URL request is the functional equivalent of the message and *McNeely* clearly teaches that either the request object or the response object, <u>not</u> the URL request, is forwarded, Applicants respectfully request that *McNeely* does not teach or suggest "if it is determined that the message should be sent to another service, each service in the predetermined set of services <u>transmitting the message</u> to an appropriate service." Claim 1.

The foregoing remarks also apply *mutatis mutandis* to claims 58, 108, 138, 141, 142, 144, and 145.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submits that *McNeely* neither teaches nor suggests claims 1, 58, 108, 138, 141, 142, 144, or 145 or claims directly or indirectly dependent thereon.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

I.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 60, 61 and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of Francis, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,130,877 (referred to herein as "*Francis*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

II.

Claims 7 and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of Hsu, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0193635 (referred to herein as "*Hsu*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7 and 64 depend indirectly from respective claims 1 and 58. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 64 are allowable for at the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends.

III.

Claims 9 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of *Francis* as applied to claims 8 and 65, and further in view of Koren, U.S. Patent No. 7,231,596 (referred to herein as ("*Koren*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9 and 66 depend indirectly from respective claims 1 and 58. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9 and 66 are allowable for at the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends.

IV.

Claims 14-25 and 71-82 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of Popp, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,046,261 (referred to herein as "*Popp*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 14-25 depend indirectly from claim 1, and claims 71-82 depend indirectly from claim 58. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 14-25 and 71-82 are allowable for at the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends.

V.

Claims 28, 29, 32-28, 85-93 and 98-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of Jois, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,112,242 (referred to herein as "*Jois*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 28, 29, 32-28 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and claims 85-93 and 98-104 depend directly or indirectly from claim 58. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28, 29, 32-28, 85-93 and 98-104 are allowable for at the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends.

VI.

Claims 39-45, 49-55, 94 and 98-104 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *McNeely* in view of *Jois* as applied to claims 38 and 58, and further in view of *Popp*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 39-45, 49-55 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, and claims 94 and 98-104 depend directly or indirectly from claim 58. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 39-45, 49-55, 94 and 98-104 are allowable for at the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends.

VII.

Claims 109, 120 and 132 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goswami, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205554 (referred to herein as "*Goswami*"), in view of Croney, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,389,471 (referred to herein as "*Croney*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 109, 120, and 132 (by reference to claim 109) now require that "the composite user interface comprises user interfaces provided by a plurality of source applications." *Goswami* relates to "extracting information from various sources, including web pages and application programs" and "aggregating the information to create a composite document." However, claims 109, 120, and 132 create a "composite user interface" not a "composite

document". *Croney* teaches that "Web pages that share a common layout and/or functionality are associated with at least one master page and at least one endpoint page." *Croney*, Abstract. *Croney* teaches that "When a client system requests one of the web pages, the server system merges the appropriate master page and endpoint page into a resulting page that can be rendered as the requested web page by the client system." *Id.* Thus, *Croney* is also related to a document in the form of a web page.

Thus, since neither *Goswami* nor *Croney*, alone or in combination, relate to a "composite user interface [that] comprises user interfaces provided by a plurality of source applications", Applicants respectfully submit that *Goswami* in view of *Croney* neither teaches nor suggests claims 109, 120, or 132 or claims directly or indirectly dependent thereon.

VIII.

Claims 110-116 and 121-127 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goswami* in view of *Croney*, as applied to claim 109 above, and further in view of *Popp*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 110-116 depend directly or indirectly from claim 109, and claims 121-127 depend directly or indirectly from claim 120. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 110-116 and 121-127 are allowable for at the same reasons as the independent claim from which each depends.

IX.

Claims 133-138 and 140 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jois* in view of Campbell, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,747,941 (referred to herein as "*Campbell*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Jois teaches that "A composite Web page is made up of a plurality of subpages" and relates to creating the composite web page. *Jois*, Abstract. Clearly such a "composite web page" is not a composite user interface.

Campbell teaches:

The creation and maintenance of a website is made easier through automation. The user selects the data (or documents) to put on the web. Information associated with the documents is extracted from the documents and analyzed to determine the contents of the documents. A template is then automatically selected from a library of templates, and this template is used to generate the website. *Campbell*, Abstract.

Thus, since neither *Jois* nor *Campbell*, alone or in combination, relate to a "composite user interface" and specifically to "extracting at least one user interface element for inclusion in said composite user interface" as recited in claims 133 and 138, Applicants respectfully submit that *Jois* in view of *Campbell* neither teaches nor suggest claim 133 or 138 or claims directly or indirectly dependent thereon.

X.

Claim 143 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goswami* in view of *Jois*.

Claim 143 requires "aggregating user interface data received from a plurality of source applications" and "aggregating received user interface elements to form a composite user interface." *Goswami* relates to "extracting information from various sources, including web pages and application programs" and "aggregating the information to create a composite document." Thus, rather than ""aggregating received user interface elements to form a composite user interface", *Goswami* teaches forming a composite document. A "composite user interface" not a "composite document".

Jois teaches that "A composite Web page is made up of a plurality of subpages" and relates to creating the composite web page. *Jois*, Abstract. Clearly such a "composite web page" is not a composite user interface.

Thus, since neither *Goswami* nor *Jois*, alone or in combination, relate to a "composite user interface" and specifically to "aggregating user interface data received from a plurality of source applications" and "aggregating received user interface elements to form a composite user interface", Applicants respectfully submit that *Goswami* in view of *Croney* neither teaches nor suggest claim 143.

XI.

Claim 146 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Popp* in view of *McNeely*.

The Examiner states col. 5, lines 41-51 of *McNeely* provides the missing teaching of *Popp* in claim 146 of "carrying out processing specified by data stored at each child entity, the processing comprising generating a further message for transmission to at least one of said plurality of source applications." Col. 5, lines 41-51 state:

> In accordance with the preferred embodiment of the invention, triggering information previously specified in servlet component code is consolidated and handled only by the request processing switches 280. For this purpose, a switching table 282 includes entries 284 holding URL processing rules, each entry 284 specifying conditions 286 based on which actions 288 are to be taken in processing of a particular URL request 102. Actions 288 include switching the processing of the URL request 102 to a specified processing flow.
> The request switch 280, shown in FIG. 2, is associated with an ingress into the servlet network 201 implemented on application server 200.

A servlet is generally known as a Java programming language class used to extend the capabilities of servers that host applications accessed via a request-response programming model. Thus, a servlet is not a source application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Popp* in view of *McNeely* do not teach or suggest at least ""carrying out processing specified by data stored at each child entity, the processing comprising generating a further message for transmission to at least one of said plurality of source applications."

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that *Popp* in view of *McNeely* to not teach or suggest claim 146.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowance be issued. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at 512-338-9100.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kent B. Chambers/

Kent B. Chambers
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,839